DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 056 632 HE 002 619

TITLE	Study of the Status of Women Faculty at Indiana University, Bloomington Campus.
INSTITUTION	Indiana Univ., Bloomington.
PUB DATE	Jan 71
NOTE	55p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Discriminatory Attitudes (Social); *Employment Patterns; *Faculty; Females; *Higher Education; *Social Discrimination; *Women Professors

ABSTRACT

Four areas were chosen for extensive examination after polling women faculty members--hiring, promotion, salary, and power position. When the expected number of women (taking into account possible labor force dropouts) and the actual number of women was compared to the expected and actual number of men, the difference favoring men was statistically significant at the .001 level. A questionnaire asking chairmen and deans if they approved, disapproved, or had reservations about hiring women, found most approved, but two disapproved and six had reservations. Faculty wives with terminal degrees reported both a general resistance to hiring women and specific discrimination and inferior treatment of faculty wives. Women were in rank 1.23 years longer than men before being recommended for promotion and 1.59 years longer before actually being promoted. In order to take into account the effect of criteria for performance (teaching, research, and service) on salary, a matched pair study was conducted. Matches were independently confirmed. Salary differentials favored men in 20 of 25 matches. A survey of power positions indicated that women are less likely than men to have major administrative responsibilities and are underrepresented on some promotions and tenure committees, despite their willingness to assume these tasks. (LR)

ED056632

Study of the Status of Women Faculty

at

Indiana University, Bloomington Campus

HE002619

AAUP Committee on the
Status of Women
January, 1971

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Study of the Status of Women Faculty at
Indiana University, Bloomington Campus

In May, 1970, the Indiana University Chapter of the American Association of University Professors instituted a study of the status of women faculty at Indiana University, Bloomington Campus. The Committee chose four areas for intensive examination after polling women faculty members. The areas were hiring, promotion, salary , and power position. During the course of these studies the administrative officers, the faculty, and their spouses have been very cooperative, supplying most of our data, and we wish to express our gratitude to them. The results indicated that discrimination existed in each of the areas investigated. Consequently, the Committee recommends that the following corrective measures be considered:

Recommendations to Indiana University, Bloomington Campus.

Recommendation 1. Policy.

a. The University shall not discriminate against persons on the basis of sex or marital status in hiring, promotion, tenure, salary, power position, or in any other area.
b. The Chancellor shall appoint some member(s) of his office or of the faculty to survey all policies which might discriminate against women in the university community either by explicit statement or in fact. This person or persons would review progress on all of the accompanying recommendations and report the progress annually.
c. Whenever the University announces its policy prohibiting discrimination, it should state that discrimination based on sex also is prohibited.
d. The University shall impose appropriate sanctions upon the personnel who discriminate against persons on the basis of sex.

Recommendation 2. Hiring. The Chancellor's Office shall issue a directive to all deans and departmental chairmen instructing them to increase the ratio of women on the faculty of Indiana University. This directive should be issued immediately and would be implemented in the follcwing ways:

a. Dossiers of applicants shall be treated equally, without regard to sex or marital status.
b. Whenever the credentials of a woman match or exceed those of a male competitor, the woman shall be given the offer. This policy should remain in effect until the ratio of women on the faculty in regular positions equals the ratio of women receiving terminal degrees. At all times in the future the ratio of women on the faculty should approximate the ratio of women with terminal degrees.
c. The departments and schools should actively seek out qualified women by making statements about our policy in their recruiting activities.

Recommendation 3. Salary. Immediate steps should be taken to remedy salary differentials that exist for women presently on the faculty. All decisions about salary shall be based on the criteria stated in the Faculty Handbook, excluding all other considerations.

Recommendation 4. Promotion.
a. The Chancellor's Office shall stipulate that at least one woman be appointed to the All-University Promotions and Tenure Committee and that deans be instructed to appoint women to their Promotions and Tenure Committees whenever feasible. Hopefully, the presence of women on these committees will help to prevent the possibility that discriminatory attitudes might influence decisions about promotion and tenure.
b. The members of the committees should be made aware of the subtle facotrs that tend to operate against women and should be instructed to attempt to avoid letting any of these considerations influence their thinking.
c. After proportionate representation has been achieved on the entire faculty, representation on the committees should be proportional.
d. When the All-University Promotions and Tenure Committee conducts its routine check of persons who have not been recommended for promotion after a set period of time, particular attention be directed toward assessing the possibility of discrimination on the basis of sex.

Recommendation 5. Power Position. A strong positive effort should be made to involve women in significant administrative and committee appointments within the University.

Recommendation 6. Maternity Leave. The University should adopt a written policy allowing women to take a one-semester leave of absence per pregnancy. This leave would be without pay. Time on leave would not count toward tenure, the possibly delaying the tenure decision occasionally, but would otherwise be treated as leaves of absence granted for any other reason.

Recommendation 7. Independence of Faculty Spouses.
a. The Chancellor shall instruct all deans and departmental chairmen that all decisions, including those in the areas cited in the previous recommendations, be based on the performance of the individual in question and not upon her or his status as a faculty spouse.

b. Whenever the spouse of a faculty member or prospective faculty member applies for a position, the application shall be accorded the same consideration given to other applications.
c. If the applicant is in the same department or area as the spouse, the departmental chairman or dean may request that the Dean of Faculties appoint a committee of three people from allied fields to make an evaluation of the credentials of the applicant. This committee will report its evaluation to both the Dean of Faculties and to the departmental chairman or dean.
d. No person shall be denied consideration because her or his spouse has not be granted a position or because the spouse will not be continued in a position at Indiana University.

Recommendation 8. Child-care Facilities. The University has a obligation to review the local child-care facilities to insure that lack of child-care opportunities is not operating as a deterrent to women. If the existing facilities are found to be a deterrent the University should take positive steps to provide such facilities.

Recommendation to the AAUP, Indiana University.

Recommendation 9. Study of the Status of Part-time Faculty. The AAUP shall appoint a committee to study the status of part-time faculty at Indiana University.

The membership of the Indiana University Chapter of the American Association of University Professors endorsed the recommendations of the Committee on the Status of Women Faculty at their meeting on January 14, 1971, with one change in wording.

Recommendation 2b should read:

b. Whenever the credentials of a woman match or exceed those of a male competitor, the woman shall be given the offer. This policy should remain in effect until the ratio of women on the faculty in regular positions in each department or school equals the ratio of women with terminals degrees. At all times in the future the ratio of women in each department and school should approximate the ratio of women with terminal degrees in the various fields of study.

The Scope of the Investigation

Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Section 703, prohibits federal employers from discriminating against individuals because of their "...race, color, religion, sex, national origin..." This title covered federal employers only, exempting state institutions such as universities. The Executive Order 11375, October 13, 1967, explicitly prohibited discrimination on the basis of sex in federal employment, employment by federal contractors and subcontractors, and employment on federally assisted construction. Through their acceptance of federal support, universities are subject to Executive Order 11375.

To determine whether or not Indiana University was discriminating against women, the AAUP Committee on Women Faculty explored a number of areas in which such discrimination might have existed. The study was limited to full-time faculty positions on the Bloomington Campus. The study did not include individuals with appointments to or sponsored by the regional campuses even though they were located in Bloomington. These limitations were dictated by a desire to conduct the study quickly enough to make the findings timely, by other reasons of expediency, and by the need to obtain most of the information in the summer of 1970.

The first problem faced by the Committee was the identification of the areas in which discrimination on the basis of sex was most likely to have occurred or which seemed most serious. This information was sought from the persons in a position to know about discrimination based on sex: the women faculty members at Indiana University. A questionnaire was sent to 100 full-time women faculty who held the rank of assistant professor or above. The questionnaire asked for 1) personal experience of discrimination

based on sex, documented as fully as possible, 2) information about other women faculty who claimed discrimination based on sex, and 3) rankings of nine areas of possible discrimination. The respondents were encouraged to add areas to the list to be ranked. Four women had resigned their positions at Indiana University and did not respond; 30 responded in writing; 59 were contacted by telephone; and seven were on leave or failed to return the questionnaire. Of the total of 89 respondents, 18 stated that they were not aware of any discrimination on this campus that could be attributed to sex, and 10 preferred to make no comments. The remaining 66 women suggested that discrimination against female faculty might have occurred in one or more of the areas listed in Table 1. Table 1 also presents the frequencies with which each area was given a rank. Using this information as an index of importance attached by the respondents to each of these areas, the Committee selected four for more intensive study: hiring, promotion, salary, and power position.

Hiring

Hiring practices vary considerably throughout the University and the factors that contribute to hiring decisions typically are not open to public scrutiny. The Committee assumed that evidence of subtle discrimination against women would be manifested in a disproportionately low incidence of women on the faculty, in statements professing disapproval of hiring women, or in a climate generally discouraging to women. Consequently, the investigation of hiring examined 1) the observed and expected proportions of women on the faculty; 2) attitudes of chairmen and deans toward hiring women; and 3) the formal and informal experiences of faculty wives with hiring policies of Indiana University.

Table 1

Possible Areas of Discrimination Listed on Women Faculty's Questionnaire and Frequencies of Ranking

Hiring	26
Work load	17
Institutional support	16
Salary	44
Promotion	32
Tenure	17
Course Assignment	15
Nepotism	19
Power position	24
Psychological disadvantages	4

Proportionate Representation.--One procedure for evaluating the possibility of discrimination against the hiring of women is to compare the proportions of women in faculty positions at Indiana University, Bloomington Campus, with the proportions of women receiving terminal degrees throughout the United States. This procedure assumes that the proportions of women receiving terminal degrees provide an estimate of the representation of women in the pool from which faculty members are recruited.

The distribution, by sex, of the faculty among the various shcools of Indiana University was tabulated for a three-year period, 1967-68, 1968-69, and 1969-70 (Tables 2, 3, 4). The information for the years 1967-68 and 1968-69 was taken from the Indiana University Register for those years and might have omitted a few late appointees to the faculty. The information for 1969-70 was obtained from the chairmen and deans of the schools by another organization, the Concerned University Women[1] and rechecked by the Committee. All individuals with joint appointments were assigned to what was judged to be their primary department. The same assignments were made for all three years.

The percentages of women on the faculty remained relatively constant over the three-year period: 10.6% in 1969-70, 10.1% in 1968-69 and 10.2% in 1967-68. Most of the women were at the lower academic ranks. In 1969-70, 26.9% of the instructors were women; 5.2% for the full professors were women. This tendency for the proportionate representation of women to decrease with increased rank also remained fairly constant over the three years studied. The percentages of instructors or lecturers who were women varied from 20.3% (1967-68) to 26.3% (1969-70) and the percentages of women full professors, from 4.2% (1967-68) to 5.2% (1969-70).

Table 2

Composition of the Full-time Faculty at Indiana University, Bloomington Campus, by Rank, School, and Sex, 1969-70

Area of Study	Professor		Associate Professor		Assistant Professor		Lecturer Instructor		Sum over Ranks		
	Total	Women	Total	Women	Total	Women	Total	Women	Totals	Number of Women	% Women
Anthropology	8	0	5	0	2	0	1	0	16	0	.0
Astronomy	2	0	1	0	5	0	0	0	8	0	.0
Biological Sciences*	30	0	19	2	16	1	4	0	69	3	4.3
Chemistry	22	0	12	0	12	0	1	0	47	0	.0
Classical Studies	3	0	2	0	5	0	2	0	12	0	.0
Comparative Literature	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	3	0	.0
East Asian Languages	1	0	6	0	1	0	1	0	9	0	.0
Economics	19	0	6	0	5	2	4	0	34	2	5.9
English	32	2	18	1	17	1	6	1	73	7	9.6
Fine Arts	8	1	6	0	8	2	2	0	24	3	12.5
Folklore	5	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	7	1	14.3
Forensic Studies	3	0	2	0	2	0	1	0	8	0	.0
French & Italian	8	1	5	1	15	5	1	1	29	8	27.6
Geography	3	0	3	0	1	0	4	0	11	0	.0
Geology	10	0	5	0	1	0	1	0	17	0	.0
Germanic Languages	7	0	10	1	12	1	6	3	35	5	8.6
History	25	1	15	1	6	0	1	0	47	2	4.3
Home Economics	1	0	1	1	4	4	4	4	10	9	90.0
Journalism	5	1	2	0	2	0	1	1	10	2	20.0
Linguistics	4	0	2	0	2	1	3	0	11	1	9.1
Mathematics	16	1	8	0	33	0	0	0	57	1	1.8
Medical Sciences	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	3	0	.0
Near Eastern Languages	2	0	3	0	1	0	1	0	7	0	.0
Optometry	4	1	5	0	4	0	3	1	16	2	12.5
Philosophy**	7	0	6	0	8	1	0	0	21	1	4.8
Physics	14	0	9	0	15	0	0	0	38	0	.0
Political Science	14	0	11	2	5	1	2	1	32	4	12.5
Psychology	17	1	12	0	9	0	0	0	38	1	2.6
Radio & Television	4	0	6	0	3	0	1	0	14	0	.0
Religion	2	0	2	0	1	0	2	0	7	0	.0
Slavic Languages	6	0	1	0	4	2	7	2	18	4	22.2
Sociology	6	0	10	0	6	0	0	0	22	0	.0
Spanish & Portuguese	8	0	5	0	8	0	8	2	29	2	6.9
Speech & Theatre	9	0	7	0	14	3	3	1	33	4	12.1
Uralic & Altaic	2	0	4	0	3	0	2	0	11	0	.0
Totals, Arts & Science	310	10	209	9	232	26	75	17	826	62	
Percent Women		3.2		4.3		11.2		22.7		7.5	

Table 2, Continued

Area of Study	Professor Total	Professor Women	Associate Professor Total	Associate Professor Women	Assistant Professor Total	Assistant Professor Women	Lecturer Instructor Total	Lecturer Instructor Women	Sums over Ranks Number of Totals	Sums over Ranks Number of Women	% Women
Business	55	0	23	1	20	0	14	0	112	1	.9
Education	46	5	42	9	44	11	15	8	147	33	22.4
HPER	19	5	9	2	18	6	15	6	61	19	31.1
Law	13	0	6	1	6	0	3	1	28	2	7.1
Library Science	4	2	4	2	5	2	1	1	14	7	50.0
Music	54	4	37	5	11	3	10	2	112	14	12.5
Totals, Schools & Divisions	191	16	121	20	104	22	58	18	474	76	
Percent Women		8.4		16.5		21.2		31.0		16.0	
Grand Totals, I.U.	501	26	330	29	336	48	133	35	1300	138	
Percent Women		5.2		8.8		14.3		26.3		10.6	

*Includes Anatomy - Physiology, Botany, Microbiology, and Zoology
**Includes History and Philosophy of Science

Table 3

Composition of the Full-time Faculty at Indiana University, Bloomington Campus, by Rank, School, and Sex, 1968-69

Area of Study	Professor		Associate Professor		Assistant Professor		Lecturer Instructor		Sums over Ranks		
	Total	Women	Total	Women	Total	Women	Total	Women	Totals	Number of Women	% Women
Anthropology	7	0	3	0	3	0	3	0	16	0	.0
Astronomy	2	0	2	0	3	0	0	0	7	0	.0
Biological Sciences*	29	0	12	2	17	1	2	0	60	3	5.0
Chemistry	23	0	8	0	11	0	4	0	46	0	.0
Classical Studies	3	0	2	0	3	0	3	1	11	1	9.1
Comparative Literature	1	0	0	0	1	0	3	0	5	0	.0
East Asian Languages	1	0	5	0	0	0	4	1	10	1	10.0
Economics	17	0	7	1	4	1	6	1	34	3	8.8
English	25	0	26	2	13	3	6	1	70	6	8.6
Fine Arts	12	1	7	0	4	1	3	0	26	2	7.7
Folklore	3	1	2	0	0	0	1	0	6	1	16.7
Forensic Studies	2	0	1	0	5	1	3	0	11	1	9.1
French & Italian	8	1	5	1	14	5	5	1	32	8	25.0
Geography	3	0	3	0	2	0	3.	0	11	0	.0
Geology	13	0	5	0	2	0	1	0	21	0	.0
Germanic Languages	6	0	10	1	9	1	1	0	26	2	7.7
History	25	2	12	1	4	0	5	0	46	3	6.5
Home Economics	1	0	0	0	4	4	8	8	13	12	92.3
Journalism	6	1	3	0	3	0	1	1	13	2	15.4
Linguistics	3	0	2	0	3	0	5	2	13	2	15.4
Mathematics	13	1	11	0	20	0	1	0	45	1	2.2
Medical Science	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	.0
Near Eastern Languages	3	0	3	0	0	0	2	0	8	0	.0
Optometry	4	1	2	0	4	0	2	0	12	1	8.3
Philosophy**	5	0	3	0	5	0	5	1	18	1	5.6
Physics	11	0	9	0	15	0	0	0	35	0	.0
Political Science	20	0	11	1	6	2	5	0	42	3	7.1
Psychology	15	0	9	0	16	0	0	0	40	0	.0
Radio & Television	6	0	4	0	2	0	2	0	14	0	.0
Religion	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	4	0	.0
Slavic Languages	6	0	1	0	5	2	7	2	19	4	21.1
Sociology	7	0	10	0	6	0	6	0	29	0	.0
Spanish & Portuguese	8	0	7	0	5	0	12	4	32	4	25.0
Speech & Theatre	10	0	7	0	11	1	5	3	36	4	12.1
Uralic & Altaic	1	0	4	0	2	1	2	0	9	1	11.1
Totals, Arts & Science	301	8	200	9	203	23	117	26	821	66	
Percent Women		2.7		4.5		11.3		22.2		8.0	

Table 3, Continued

Area of Study	Professor Total	Professor Women	Associate Professor Total	Associate Professor Women	Assistant Professor Total	Assistant Professor Women	Lecturer Instructor Total	Lecturer Instructor Women	Sums over Ranks Number of Total	Sums over Ranks Number of Women	Sums over Ranks % Women
Business	51	0	24	1	20	0	12	0	107	1	.9
Education	55	7	55	11	50	8	29	7	189	33	17.5
HPER	16	3	9	3	14	4	19	5	58	15	25.9
Law	14	0	1	0	9	1	0	0	24	1	4.2
Library Science	4	1	5	3	4	3	1	1	14	8	57.1
Music	50	3	31	2	22	4	9	1	112	10	8.9
Totals, Schools & Divisions	190	14	125	20	119	20	70	14	504	68	
Percent Women		7.4		16.0		16.8		20.0		13.5	
Grand Totals, I.U.	491	22	325	29	322	43	187	40	1325	134	
Percent Women		4.5		8.9		13.3		21.4		10.1	

*Includes Anatomy & Physiology, Botany, Microbiology, and Zoology
**Includes History and Philosophy of Science

Table 4

Composition of the Full-time Faculty at Indiana University, Bloomington Campus, by Rank, School, and Sex, 1967-68

Area of Study	Professor		Associate Professor		Assistant Professor		Lecturer-Instructor		Sums over Ranks		
	Total	Women	Total	Women	Total	Women	Total	Women	Totals	Number of Women	% Women
Anthropology	8	0	3	0	3	0	3	0	17	0	.0
Astronomy	2	0	1	0	3	0	0	0	6	0	.0
Biological Sciences*	29	0	10	2	16	2	2	0	57	4	7.0
Chemistry	19	0	4	0	15	0	3	1	41	1	2.4
Classical Studies	2	0	3	0	3	0	1	1	9	0	.0
Comparative Literature	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	.0
East Asian Languages	1	0	5	0	0	0	1	0	7	0	.0
Economics	16	0	9	1	7	1	6	0	38	2	5.3
English	21	0	26	2	16	2	7	1	70	5	7.1
Fine Arts	12	1	4	0	5	2	3	0	24	3	12.5
Folklore	2	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	5	1	20.0
Forensic Studies	2	0	1	0	3	1	3	0	9	1	11.1
French and Italian	7	1	3	1	13	3	7	2	30	7	23.3
Geography	3	0	3	0	3	0	2	0	11	0	.0
Geology	12	0	5	0	3	0	1	0	21	0	.0
Germanic Languages	7	0	4	0	14	2	2	0	27	2	7.4
History	22	2	11	1	5	0	3	0	41	3	7.3
Home Economics	0	0	1	1	5	5	8	8	14	14	100.0
Journalsim	3	1	2	0	3	0	1	0	9	1	11.1
Linguistics	4	0	2	0	5	0	7	2	18	2	11.1
Mathematics	13	1	8	0	15	0	2	0	38	1	2.6
Medical Sciences	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	3	0	.0
Near Eastern Languages	3	0	4	0	0	0	2	0	9	0	.0
Optometry	4	1	3	0	3	0	2	0	12	1	8.3
Philosophy **	8	0	3	0	3	0	3	1	17	1	5.9
Physics	10	0	8	0	11	0	0	0	29	0	.0
Political Science	18	0	9	0	11	3	7	0	45	3	6.7
Psychology	14	0	10	0	15	0	0	0	39	0	.0
Radio & Television	3	0	6	0	4	0	0	0	13	0	.0
Religion	1	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	4	0	.0
Slavic Languages	5	0	2	1	6	0	12	6	25	7	28.0
Sociology	7	0	6	0	8	0	4	0	25	0	.0
Spanish & Portuguese	9	1	6	0	7	1	12	3	34	5	14.7
Speech & Theatre	9	0	6	0	11	2	7	4	33	6	18.2
Uralic & Altaic	2	0	3	0	3	1	3	0	11	1	9.1
Totals, Arts & Science	280	8	175	10	222	25	116	28	793	71	
Percent Women		2.9		5.7		11.3		24.1		9.0	

Table 4, Continued

Area of Study	Professor Total	Professor Women	Associate Professor Total	Associate Professor Women	Assistant Professor Total	Assistant Professor Women	Lecturer Instructor Total	Lecturer Instructor Women	Sums over Ranks Total	Sums over Ranks Number of Women	Sums over Ranks % Women
Business	[illegible]4	0	29	1	21	0	14	0	108	1	.9
Education	51	5	45	10	58	10	32	3	186	28	15.1
HPER	17	3	6	2	14	4	19	8	56	17	30.3
Law	22	0	5	0	7	1	3	0	38	1	2.6
Library Science	7	1	4	2	4	3	[illegible]0	0	15	6	40.0
Music	53	3	28	3	22	3	8	0	111	9	8.1
Totals, Schools & Divisions	194	12	117	18	127	21	76	11	514	62	
Percent Women		6.2		15.4		16.5		14.5		12.1	
Grand Totals, I.U.	474	20	292	28	349	46	192	39	1307	133	
Percent Women		4.2		9.6		13.2		20.3		10.2	

* Includes Anatomy & Physiology, Botany, Microbiology, and Zoology
**Includes History and Philosophy of Science

The proportions of women on the I.U. faculty must be compared with the proportions of qualified women in the United States to evaluate the possibility of discrimination based on sex. Discrimination attributable to sex could be inferred only if the proportions of women on the I.U. faculty differed significantly from the proportions of women in the pool of qualified personnel. To answer this question, the numbers and percentages of women receiving terminal degrees from all institutions of higher learning in the U.S. in fields offered at Indiana University were obtained from the publications of the United States Office of Education for the years, 1958-1968. Table 5 lists the percentages of terminal degrees conferred on women by all institutions in the United States. These percentages are broken down by area of study for the ten-year period. The percentages given in Table 5 are calculated from the total numbers of terminal degrees awarded (Table 6) and the numbers granted to women (Table 7). The overall percentage of women receiving terminal degrees during the ten years (18.1%) exceeded the percentage of women on the I.U. faculty for the three years studied (10.3%). Thus, women, appear to be under-represented on the Bloomington Campus faculty of Indiana University.

The discrepancies varied from field to field. The percentages of women receiving terminal degrees in individual fields may be contrasted with the percentages of women employed in those fields at I.U. in 1969-70 by comparing the right-most columns of Tables 5 and 2. The greatest differentials occurred in the fields of Music, Fine Arts, East Asian Languages, Spanish and Portuguese, and Anthropology. The apparent differentials associated with Classical Studies and Comparative Literature arose in part from the fact that most of the faculty in these departments at I.U. have their primary appointments in other departments.

The disproportions noted above might have arisen because some qualified

Table 5

Percent of Terminal Degrees for Females, All Institutions in the U.S., by Area of Study, 1958-1968

Area of Study	1967-68	1966-67	1965-66	1964-65	1963-64	1962-63	1961-62	1960-61	1959-60	1958-59	Overall 1958-68
Anthropology	24	26	21	16	18	27	15	14	17	31	21.25
Astronomy	10	6	8	8	8	4	4	7	0	6	7.08
Biological Sciences	16	15	15	12	12	12	12	12	10	11	13.08
Chemistry	8	7	6	7	7	6	6	5	5	5	6.37
Classical Studies	29	22	19	31	20	16	23	24	21	0	22.85
Comparative Literature	36	30	24	18	8	7	23	17	29	11	20.79
East Asian		0	0	40	0	33	50	0	0	100	25.00
Economics	6	7	5	4	4	6	6	5	6	5	5.37
English	27	23	23	22	21	22	20	21	21	17	22.20
Fine Arts	38	41	43	41	41	38	39	36	39	36	39.71
Folklore	30	25	33	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	29.41
French & Italian	37	43	43	49	40	24	36	30	38	37	38.58
Geography	2	5	10	7	7	7	7	6	6	16	6.83
Geology	2	2	3	1	2	2	2	1	2	3	1.93
Germanic Languages	24	16	25	18	27	24	30	28	28	17	22.82
History	13	14	12	9	10	12	12	7	9	15	11.47
Home Economics	93	92	95	96	96	96	95	95	97	97	95.10
Journalism	16	17	20	12	7	9	0	0	13	0	11.80
Linguistics	21	30	33	15	21	26	18	23	12	33	23.81
Mathematics	5	7	7	9	5	7	6	5	6	5	6.39
Near Eastern Languages	14	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	-	3.57
Optometry	3	3	1	2	2	1	2	1	1	0	1.70
Philosophy (+ Hist., Phil of Sc.)	10	11	11	12	7	13	11	12	18	10	11.14
Physics	2	3	2	2	1	1	2	1	2	2	1.91
Political Science	11	10	9	9	8	6	6	6	8	8	8.42
Psychology	22	19	21	18	19	17	19	19	15	15	18.83
Religion	4	2	4	3	5	8	0	3	4	6	3.95
Slavic Languages	33	33	35	21	20	15	6	13	20	13	23.45
Sociology	19	18	15	16	15	15	15	17	16	10	15.96
Spanish & Portuguese	31	30	33	35	36	32	38	25	38	35	32.48
Speech & Theatre	19	16	16	14	14	12	20	15	20	13	15.90
Uralic & Altaic	10	20	17	19	9	20	19	13	17	17	16.59
Business	4	4	5	3	5	3	4	4	4	8	4.05
Education	20	20	19	19	19	19	18	20	19	19	19.48
HPER	28	30	31	29	23	28	34	25	23	28	28.08

Table 5, Continued

Percent of Terminal Degrees for Females, All Institutions in the U.S., by Area of Study, 1958-1968

Area of Study	1967-68	1966-67	1965-66	1964-65	1963-64	1962-63	1961 62	1960-61	1959-60	1958-69	Overall 1958-68
Law	4	4	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3.37
Library Science	32	38	26	8	31	41	30	0	11	33	25.00
Music	52	50	51	51	50	51	51	49	51	51	50.65
Overall Percentages	19	18	18	18	18	18	18	17	18	17	18.06

Source: U.S., Office of Education, Earned Degrees Conferred, issued annually.

Table 6

Terminal Degrees Conferred by All Institutions in the U.S. by Area of Study, 1959-1968

Area of Study	1967-68	1966-67	1965-66	1964-65	1963-64	1962-63	1961-62	1960-61	1959-60	1958-59	Total 1958-68
Anthropology	138	136	98	88	85	86	82	49	72	55	889
Astronomy	87	53	40	52	40	28	25	14	11	17	367
Biological Sciences	2786	2256	2097	1928	1625	1455	1338	1193	1205	1045	16928
Chemistry	1723	1700	1533	1377	1271	1219	1114	1131	1048	1009	13125
Classical Studies	89	58	63	64	49	38	30	37	29	20	477
Comparative Literature	39	44	54	40	38	29	26	41	21	19	351
East Asian	-	1	2	5	2	3	2	2	2	1	20
Economics	600	546	458	410	385	331	268	266	237	221	3722
English	977	848	699	689	556	516	486	400	397	373	5941
Fine Arts	2668	2270	1861	1477	1334	1169	1031	984	824	821	14439
Folklore	10	4	3	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	17
French & Italian	163	113	83	76	78	58	56	43	63	60	793
Geography	96	79	58	70	67	61	58	50	68	51	658
Geology	280	285	290	274	237	265	199	202	201	198	2431
Germanic Languages	126	107	102	73	82	42	47	39	25	36	679
History	688	655	599	576	507	378	343	371	342	324	4783
Home Economics	1037	916	794	732	637	587	584	627	524	533	6971
Journalism	32	23	15	17	14	11	7	8	8	9	144
Linguistics	97	70	84	60	48	38	33	31	26	21	508
Mathematics	983	870	801	688	596	490	396	344	303	282	5753
Near Eastern Languages	7	5	3	3	4	-	1	3	2	-	28
Optometry	460	477	401	389	315	379	291	317	342	268	3639
Philosophy	278	249	203	144	137	134	123	146	137	100	1651
Physics	1260	1183	973	942	778	752	667	564	487	482	8088
Political Science	457	390	336	304	263	228	214	217	201	191	2801
Psychology	1177	1163	1016	823	928	834	765	686	641	635	8668
Religion	187	94	97	90	94	63	53	75	57	50	860
Slavic Languages	30	21	20	19	15	13	16	15	5	8	162
Sociology	367	327	244	230	198	208	173	184	161	157	2249
Spanish & Portuguese	125	110	83	69	47	44	34	44	32	40	628
Speech & Theatre	269	249	240	231	206	185	164	135	146	124	1949
Uralic & Altaic	30	49	18	27	11	10	16	8	24	36	229
Business	569	553	480	418	351	319	285	226	182	214	3597
Education	3966	3421	2958	2607	2250	1982	1834	1664	1494	1533	23709
HPER	204	176	135	125	109	103	82	96	96	81	1207
Law	17452	15691	14251	12493	11499	10592	10065	10132*	9858	10449	122482
Library Science	22	16	19	12	13	17	10	14	19	6	148

Table 6, Continued

Terminal Degrees Conferred by All Institutions in the U.S. by Area of Study, 1959-68

Area of Study	1967-68	1966-67	1965-66	1964-65	1963-64	1962-63	1961-62	1960-61	1959-60	1958-59	Total 1958-68
Music	6256	5877	5424	5073	4506	4436	4203	4028	4278	4024	48105
Grand Total	45735	41085	36635	32695	29375	27103	25121	24386	23568	23493	305196

*Added bachelor's

Source: U.S., Office of Education, Earned Degrees Conferred, issued annually.

Table 7
Terminal Degrees Conferred by All Institutions in the U.S. by Area of Study, Females, 1959-1968

Area of Study	1967-68	1966-67	1965-66	1964-65	1963-64	1962-63	1961-62	1960-61	1959-60	1958-59	Total 1958-68
Anthropology	33	35	21	14	15	23	12	7	12	17	189
Astronomy	9	3	3	4	3	1	1	1	-	1	26
Biological Sciences	439	342	305	230	193	176	159	140	119	112	2215
Chemistry	139	116	91	100	92	76	69	57	48	49	837
Classical Studies	26	13	12	20	10	6	7	9	6	-	109
Comparative Literature	14	13	13	7	3	2	6	7	6	2	73
East Asian	-	-	-	2	-	1	1	-	-	1	5
Economics	35	37	22	17	17	20	15	13	14	10	200
English	260	199	159	149	115	111	96	82	83	65	1310
Fine Arts	1023	928	805	608	547	448	406	350	325	294	5734
Folklore	3	1	1	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	5
French & Italian	60	49	36	37	31	14	20	13	24	22	306
Geography	2	4	6	5	5	4	4	3	4	8	45
Geology	6	5	10	1	5	5	3	3	4	5	47
Germanic Languages	30	17	25	13	22	10	14	11	7	6	155
History	90	94	72	50	52	46	40	25	32	48	549
Home Economics	966	847	753	705	614	565	557	598	507	518	6630
Journalism	5	4	3	2	1	1	-	-	1	-	17
Linguistics	20	21	28	9	10	10	6	7	3	7	121
Mathematics	52	60	57	60	29	36	24	17	18	15	368
Near Eastern Languages	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Optometry	12	16	4	8	5	3	5	4	4	1	62
Philosophy(His., Phil Sci)	27	27	22	17	9	17	13	17	25	10	184
Physics	26	30	21	20	11	10	12	6	10	9	155
Political Science	52	38	29	26	21	13	12	13	17	15	236
Psychology	263	217	213	151	178	140	146	130	97	98	1633
Religion	8	2	4	3	5	5	-	2	2	3	34
Slavic Languages	10	7	7	4	3	2	1	2	1	1	38
Sociology	68	59	36	36	29	31	26	32	26	16	359
Spanish & Portuguese	39	33	27	24	17	14	13	11	12	14	204
Speech & Theatre	50	40	39	32	29	23	32	20	29	16	310
Uralic & Altaic	3	10	3	5	1	2	3	1	4	6	38
Business	22	20	22	13	16	11	10	8	7	17	146
Education	796	684	567	501	434	378	338	341	287	294	4620
HPER	57	53	42	36	25	29	28	24	22	23	339

Table 7, Continued
Terminal Degrees Conferred by All Institutions in the U.S. by Area of Study, Females, 1959-1968

Area of Study	1967-68	1966-67	1965-66	1964-65	1963-64	1962-63	1961-62	1960-61	1959-60	1958-59	Total 1958-68
Law	714	607	547	419	366	336	310	290	265	281	4135
Library Science	7	6	5	1	4	7	3	-	2	2	37
Music	3202	2947	2751	2582	2247	2249	2163	1993	2186	2049	24369
Total Women	8569	7584	6761	5911	5164	4825	4555	4237	4209	4035	55850

Source: U.S., Office of Education, Earned Degrees Conferred, issued annually.

women voluntarily withdrew from the labor force or never entered it. Studies[2] of women doctorates indicated that seven to eight years following graduation, 81.3% to 82% of the women were working full-time, despite the fact that most of women surveyed were 34 years of age or less, the age range of least labor force participation short of retirement. One of these studies reported that labor force participation rose to 91% when part-time positions were included and that only 2% had never been employed since receiving the doctorate.

For purposes of comparing the estimated number of women in the pool from which faculty are hired and the number of women on the I.U. faculty, the conservative assumption was made that 81% of the women receiving terminal degrees during the years 1958-68 entered the labor force. Presumably, then, an average of 45238.5 women both received terminal degrees and entered the labor force each year, or 14.6% of the total qualified pool. This figure, 14.6% may then be compared with proportionate representation of women faculty on the Bloomington Campus, 10.6%. The expected number of women faculty in 1969-70 would be 190; the observed number was 138. The comparable expected and observed numbers of male faculty members were 1110 and 1162. These differences were statistically significant, χ^2 (1) = 16.67, $p < .001$, indicating that women were not represented on the faculty of the Bloomington Campus in proportion to the numbers of qualified women likely to be available in the United States, even when possible labor-force dropout was taken into account. While it is true that some academically qualified women and men are not employed in academics, this type of evidence of the disproportionately low incidence of women on a faculty has been the basis of suits filed against more than 200 universities charging discrimination because of sex.[3]

Attitudes toward hiring women: Statements by Chairmen.--Information about the attitudes of departmental chairmen and deans toward hiring women was obtained from a survey conducted by the Concerned University Women. The questionnaire prepared by the Concerned Women was taken to all departmental chairmen in the College of Arts and Science and to the deans of the other schools of Indiana University, in May and June, 1970. In addition to asking for the total numbers of faculty and of women at each rank, which provided most of the entries in Table 2, and other questions[4], the questionnaire asked if the respondents approved, disapproved, or had reservations about hiring women. Thirty-four respondents approved; two disapproved; six had reservations. This question was not answered in the four cases when secretaries filled out the questionnaire. A single statement of disapproval may be used as evidence of institutional discrimination.

Attitudes toward hiring women: Experiences of Faculty Wives.--Another approach to the question of hiring was to determine the response received by qualified faculty wives who applied, formally or informally, for faculty positions at Indiana University. A questionnaire was constructed which asked about the fields and degrees held by the respondents, about their experiences with hiring policies, whether they thought discrimination, if any,was attributable to sex, etc. The questionnaire was sent to 552 women who were wives of faculty listed in the Schedule of Classes, Summer Session, 1970, and to other faculty wives known to be in Bloomington during the summer of 1970. Faculty wives with full-time faculty appointments at the rank of assistant professor or above were excluded from this mailing because they had received the questionnaire sent to women faculty members.

A total of 204 women responded, 28 or 13.7% had terminal degrees, and were assumed to be qualified, academically, for employment by universities.

Three of the women with terminal degrees did not want a faculty position, one will be employed as faculty; 14 have been, or are employed in temporary, part-time teaching positions or as research associates even though they sought full-time academic employment; and ten had sought faculty appointments unsuccessfully (some had held temporary appointments in the past.)

Many of the respondents felt that discrimination related to sex existed in the hiring policies of Indiana University or some of its departments. Some women reported encountering a general resistance to hiring women:

> "There was an opening, definitely temporary, for someone to teach _____ until the position could be filled permanently. I was fully qualified to teach it; my name was proposed by a member of the department,... and the reaction of Dr. _____, who was then the chairman..., was "Oh no, the Trustees would never hear of it!"
>
> Dr. _____ was notorious for his contempt for female _____. Had he wished he could have hired me,... The graduate student who got the job was less well qualified than I."
>
> _____ is exceedingly well qualified--very good lecturer--and she was told that she would never be given a position by _____.
>
> It is a definite policy of the chairman of the _____ Department not to hire any woman instructor, however qualified (whether single or married)...

Other women felt that the discrimination was against hiring faculty wives:

> "I was admitted as a grad student...with a T.A. Six months later, I married a faculty member in the_____ Department. I continued my studies...while receiving continuous direct and indrect indications that I would never be considered for employment at I.U., even if I changed my field, because I was a faculty wife. One senior faculty member, in a position of hiring power, told me that he did not like hiring wives because of a potential "block vote" between husband and wife if, per chance, they should be assigned to the same committee. (The fact that the important committees in the _____ Department have been controlled by power-blocks formed by certain common interests during the last few years didn't seem to count in the same way.)

> ...I realized that it would be useless to continue my studies without prospects for a job. However, I have not been academically idle... The respondent detailed an impressive list of her professional activities. I might add that the most common responses I have had to my complaints about practices here have been, 'Why don't you have a baby?'...
> "...a...friend of mine asked Prof. _____ if she could hire me to work with her...He is said to have said that he never hired faculty wives..."
>
> "...I was constantly discouraged by remarks that there was a general policy against wives teaching at the same institution as the husband."

Another related complaint was that advantages were taken of faculty wives:

> "I was offered the same kinds of jobs I had had previously as a graduate student, even though I was more fully qualified and experienced. When I inquired about obtaining a regular faculty appointment, I was told I would be considered last, after all other candidates...To my knowledge, no male Ph.D.'s were offered only left-over courses to teach for one semester at the last minute, with no promise of employment until final course assignments were being made... ... (Men) were appointed Assistant Professor as soon as they obtained the Ph.D."
>
> "Because of my status as a faculty wife I am kept at a very low salary and considered a part-time teacher. I have all of the work of the full-time people... (committees) which require countless hours. My reputation has grown so that I have to turn away students."
>
> "...as a faculty wife I was continually, vastly underpaid (and given no status except 'visiting lecturer'."
>
> "One semester, the _____asked me to teach a graduate course..., an offer which I gladly accepted. My title that semester was not encouraging: visiting part-time lecturer. (This title was agreed upon only after I refused to be called a teaching associate.)"
>
> "I am retained as a part-time teacher despite the fact that my academic credentials are superior to those of some of the people for whom I've substituted. I have heard, from a number of sources, that _____ refuses to appoint spouses to his faculty, regardless of qualifications, or to allow pregnant women to continue working. The ban on pregnant women covers all women working under his jurisdiction. This particular man terminated one woman's appointment because she was pregnant, not because she requested the termination. And, once the baby was born, he wished to hire her again. How archaic!"

Some wives without terminal degrees reported that there was little incentive to complete their education because the possibilities of their being hired were too low:

> "I would have been interested in getting a degree in _____ but felt there was no chance to teach."
>
> "I certainly would have accelerated my academic work through these years as a homemaker had I thought there were a greater possibility of work in the same institution that employs my husband. ...My final choice (of field) was a compromise based on realities; not the field most interesting to me...Informally I have observed reports and comments from professors in (several departments listed) that, all things being equal, they preferred to hire males over females-and usually did so when a female candidate appeared on the list."
>
> "In _____, there is a general discrimination against faculty spouses...While working toward a Ph.D. in _____, I realized that the endeavor was useless, since it is impossible for me to teach in the _____ as long as my husband is employed there..."
>
> "When approached, the personnel office seemed unbending in terms of utilizing faculty wives on a part-time basis. Much real talent has been lost to the university. I did not go on for a Ph.D. in part because I felt it would be very difficult to secure a permanent full-time position at I.U. as a faculty wife."

Other faculty wives mentioned that inadequate child care facilities had hindered their academic progress:

> "Not having adequate day-care facilities at a reasonable cost had helped keep progress toward the degree slow."

The statements above indicated that many academically qualified faculty wives either were not considered for employment or were given part-time appointments with none of the benefits and safeguards of a regular faculty position. Most of the individuals in these categories felt that their credentials either were not examined at all because of some feeling against hiring faculty wives or were not given serious consideration. The tenor

of the remarks suggested that these qualified women were asking for the same consideration granted to other applicants for positions in the departments, not for special or unusual treatment. They apparently felt that the failure to provide such consideration originated at the departmental level rather than coming from an unwritten institutional policy that was more stringent than the Faculty Handbook statement on nepotism.

A number of the women with part-time or temporary positions noted that they had not been granted the treatment usually given to men. In one case, the faculty wife employed in a part-time position had been led to believe that she would be teaching in a particular semester. She began preparation of her course, only to be notified five days before the semester began that she would not be teaching. It is difficult to imagine that a man, holding a terminal degree in the field as she does, would have been accorded the same discourtesy. In at least three other cases, the women employed in part-time positions apparently have taught full-time loads, been assigned to departmental committees, counseled students, and generally have assumed the responsibilities and obligations of regular faculty members without enjoying the benefits of regular faculty employment.

It should be noted that a number of women with regular faculty appointments are faculty wives (17 of 103 women with the rank of assistant professor or above in 1969-70). Of this number, 15 were married when they were hired initially by Indiana University and five, or one-third, of these women, were hired originally in part-time or tangential (e.g., "visiting") positions. Transition from the temporary position to a tenure-ladder appointment occurred only after the receipt of an outside offer, fellowship, or some other external recognition of professional capability. Obviously, the employing department at I.U. had access to the same information about the woman's

credentials as the outside agency and chose not to change her status until forced to do so to retain her services. The implication appeared to be that Indiana University was and is taking advantage of the limited mobility of these academically qualified faculty wives--an attitude which has already generated some hostility.

In summary, these investigations of the hiring practices showed that fewer women were hired for regular faculty positions than would be expected on the basis of the number of qualified women; two departmental chairmen disapproved of hiring women; qualified faculty wives had difficult obtaining regular faculty positions and other faculty wives were discouraged from continuing their educations.

Promotion

The question of possible sex discrimination in promotions was approached by comparing the average length of time in rank before men and women faculty were put up for promotion by their departments, and the average length of time in rank before men and women actually were promoted. This information was provided by the Dean of Faculties' Office. The Committee also submitted a list of questions to some members of promotions and tenure committees about policy matters and about the specific reasons for a few cases which appeared to involve delayed or rejected promotions.

Time in Rank Preceding Recommendation and Promotion.--Over the three-year period, women had been in rank an average of 6.07 years before being recommended for promotion; men had been in rank an average of 4.84 years before recommendation for promotion. The average years in rank before recommendation for promotion are given in Table 8 for each of the three years. Table 9 presents the average number of years in rank before actual promotion. Women

were in rank 6.22 years before promotion; men, 4.63 years. Thus, women were in rank about 1.23 years longer than men before being recommended for promotion and 1.59 years longer before actually being promoted.

The primary reason for obtaining both sets of figures was to provide at least a rough estimate of the locus of discrimination. A differential in the number of years in rank preceding recommendation for promotion implied that the discrimination occurred at the departmental level. The data suggested this to be the case. The number of years in rank before actual promotion would be based upon the number of years before recommendation plus time when the promotions were denied. An increase in the differential from years to recommendation to the years to promotion would point to supra-departmental committees and officials as locus of discrimination. As noted above, women were in rank 1.23 years longer before recommendation and 1.59 years longer before promotion. The difference between these two figures was quite small, indicating that, by comparison with the time before recommendation by department, the time to actual promotion conferred by higher offices was not significant. However, to ask the question differently, we computed the percentage of females and males receiving recommendations who were actually promoted. The percentages were 71.4% and 79.2% for women and men, respectively, taken over all three years. This difference was not statistically significant, corroborating the earlier evidence that the primary source of the longer time in rank before both recommendation and promotion was at the departmental level.

The results indicated that women are promoted more slowly than men. It is possible that women met the standards of teaching, research, and service necessary for promotion more slowly than men but the burden of proof would be on the University. We did attempt to probe a few cases of alleged slow or rejected promotion in the discussions with members of promotions and tenure committees.

Table 8

Average Years in Rank When Recommended for Promotion, 1968-70.

	Instructor to Assistant Professor				Assistant Professor to Associate Professor				Associate Professor to Professor				Totals			
	Men		Women		Men		Women		Men		Women		Men		Women	
	No.	Ave.	No.	Ave.	No.	Ave.	No.	Ave.	No.	Ave.	No.	Ave.	No.	Ave.	No.	Ave.
Spring, 1968	8	3.87	2	5.00	67	4.36	5	4.75	41	4.15	6	5.19	116	4.46	13	4.65
Spring, 1969	8	6.19	1	7.00	60	4.05	8	5.33	38	4.92	3	8.75	106	5.05	12	7.03
Spring, 1970	4	5.75	1	4.00	57	4.43	6	6.75	39	4.82	3	8.80	100	5.00	10	6.52
Total													322	4.84	35	6.07

Table 9

Average Years in Rank Before Promotion, 1968-70.

	Instructor to Assistant Professor				Assistant Professor to Associate Professor				Associate Professor to Professor				Totals			
	Men		Women		Men		Women		Men		Women		Men		Women	
	No.	Ave.	No.	Ave.	No.	Ave.	No.	Ave.	No.	Ave.	No.	Ave.	No.	Ave.	No.	Ave.
Spring, 1968	8	3.88	1	4.00	56	4.68	4	4.88	31	4.10	3	5.75	95	4.22	8	4.88
Spring, 1969	5	4.67	2	6.75	47	4.36	7	5.21	34	4.90	3	10.25	86	4.64	12	7.40
Spring, 1970	4	5.25	-	-	43	4.78	3	3.75	27	5.10	4	9.00	74	5.04	7	6.38
Totals													255	4.63	27	6.22

Discussions with Members of Promotions and Tenure Committees.-- A few members of promotion and tenure committees and administrative officials were asked about the promotion decisions in specific cases. Some women faculty members suggested that the delay or denial of their promotions might have been discriminatory and a few faculty wives made similar charges with respect to some women faculty members. The Committee tried to investigate these claims but we did not have access to personal files. Consequently, we relied on the consistency of the information we had with the responses made by higher administrative officers.

We were informed of one slow promotion by the woman involved and by two administrative officers. The promotion eventually was granted. The tardiness in making this promotion appeared to have been partially attributable to the woman's status as a faculty wife. Another case was considered by the Committee to have been unduly retarded but the individuals to whom we spoke failed to concur. The decisions about promotions in three other cases were judged to have been fair. Some other women were promoted as fast or faster than their male colleagues. These women may have been exceptional. One woman expressed surprise at her promotion; she had evaluated herself as less deserving than colleagues who were not promoted.

The members of the promotions and tenure committees were queried about four areas that might have produced subtle discrimination against women. The first question dealt with the possibility that departments might delay recommending women for promotion until their credentials presented a more unassailable case than was true for men. The individuals polled all rejected this notion, citing a number of cases which contradicted our contention.

The second question considered the possibility that women might stress certain areas of professional activity, such as teaching, and place less

emphasis on research and service. If the reviewing committees placed higher weights on research or service than on teaching, women might be handicapped. We asked for an average rating for the dossiers of males and females on each of the three areas whose promotions had been approved or denied. Our respondents felt that they could not mkae these judgments about the dossiers of women because the numbers of cases were too small.

The third consideration dealt with the effect of outside offers. Some studies have shown that women receive fewer outside offers than their male colleagues. If this is true at Indiana University and if the receipt of an outside offer facilitates promotion, women might encounter more difficulty than men. The people with whom we spoke indicated that such offers had very little impact upon promotion decisions for either the individual with the offer or for the other persons being considered at the same time. It was conceded that offers might boost salaries, however.

Some of our faculty respondents were convinced that outside offers did impress their chairmen. They cited promises of early promotion or tenure to individuals whose credentials had not been considered as part of the routine decisions on promotion and tenure that particular year.

Fourth, we asked if the lesser mobility of women might enable the reviewing bodies to procrastinate. The response was that promotion was unlikely to be affected in this way, salaries might be.

The evidence of discrimination based on sex was more striking at the lower decision levels. The consistent tendency for women to be in rank longer than men before recommendation and promotion reinforced the pattern of sex discrimination observed in the hiring practices of Indiana University, Bloomington Campus.

Salary

A large number of women faculty members felt that salary discrimination existed at Indiana University and our discussions with many male faculty pointed to salary as the area most likely to show a differential against women, once women were on the faculty. Obviously, salaries differ as a function of the legitimate factors that comprise the professional qualification of a university professor; our concern was whether or not salary differentials could be traced to a discrimination based on sex. The results of an investigation by S. Berry and M. Erenburg of the Department of Economics, Indiana University[5], on salaries paid in December, 1968, suggested that such a differential did exist. They examined the contributions of the following factors to salary: type of appointment, rank, school of the university, length of time since receipt of highest degree, and sex. When the other factors were held constant statistically, men received an average of $98.19 more,per month, than women in 1968. Data supplied by the Bureau of Institutional Research on salaries paid ruing the second semester, 1969-70, indicated that the differential also was present at that time. These data were tabulated by rank, marital status, school or division of the university, and sex (Tables 10-15). In general, men were paid more than women of the same rank in the same division of the university.

Neither of these studies considered the factors of research, teaching, and service, the three areas that contribute to decisions about salary, according to the Indiana University Faculty Handbook, p. 24. The Committee decided against trying to measure the influence of these three variables upon salary in a direct way. Our reasons were numerous, but the single most important deterrent that mitigated against a direct approach was that we had no reliable yardsticks for measuring the performance of all faculty members

Table 10
Average Salary by Sex/School, Bloomington Campus
Second Semester 1969-1970
Rank: All Ranks Combined

School/Division	Number		Women			Men		
	Women	Men	Single	Married	Total	Single	Married	Total
A&S College:								
Arts & Humanities	27	292	$11,931	$11,650	$11,869	$12,479	$15,097	$14,667
Biological Sciences	*	61	11,140		11,140	14,257	17,332	16,979
Physical Sciences	*	159	18,800		18,800	13,644	16,092	15,707
Social Sciences	*	156	10,800	12,560	12,057	12,814	16,410	16,064
Non-Div. & Prof. Depts.	*	39	12,511	9,189	11,403	12,488	14,885	14,700
A&S College	47	707	12,104	11,447	11,908	12,954	15,806	15,410
School of Business	*	102		11,450	11,450	17,138	18,043	17,964
School of Music	11	104	11,300	13,250	12,009	12,145	14,601	14,341
School of HPER	16	59	10,528	11,950	10,706	9,820	13,210	12,922
School of Law	*	26	12,916		12,916	13,333	19,895	19,138
Library Science	*	*	12,989	14,200	13,140	15,000	16,452	16,244
School of Education	39	159	11,917	10,897	11,655	12,296	14,131	14,038
No School	*	*	10,580		10,580		17,755	17,755
Bloomington Campus	124	1,173	$11,804	$11,618	$11,756	$13,036	$15,631	$15,332

SOURCE: Bureau of Institutional Research Records, Indiana University

* The number of cases was less than 10.

Table 11
Average Salary by Sex/School, Bloomington Campus
Second Semester 1969-1970
Rank: Distinguished Professor

School/Division	Number		Women			Men		
	Women	Men	Single	Married	Total	Single	Married	Total
A&S College:								
Arts & Humanities		14					$23,714	$23,714
Biological Sciences		*					27,475	27,475
Physical Sciences		*				$30,000	27,513	27,869
Social Sciences		*					24,725	24,725
Non-Div. & Prof. Depts.								
A&S College		33				$30,000	25,149	25,296
School of Business		*					26,625	26,625
School of Music		*					21,500	21,500
School of HPER								
School of Law		*					26,150	26,150
Library Science								
School of Education		*					20,541	20,541
No School								
Bloomington Campus		43				$30,000	$24,944	$25,062

SOURCE: Bureau of Institutional Research Records, Indiana University

* The number of cases was less than 10.

Table 12
Average Salary by Sex/School, Bloomington Campus
Second Semester 1969-1970
Rank: Professor

School/Division	Number Women	Number Men	Women Single	Women Married	Women Total	Men Single	Men Married	Men Total
A&S College:								
Arts & Humanities	*	104	$15,240	$13,500	$14,771	$15,930	$18,080	$17,873
Biological Sciences		26				20,500	20,617	20,608
Physical Sciences	*	57	18,800		18,800	20,025	19,963	19,967
Social Sciences	*	61		16,500	16,500	20,000	19,736	19,741
Non-Dv. & Prof. Depts.	*	14	15,133		15,133		17,992	17,992
A&S College	11	262	15,658	14,566	15,360	17,670	19,136	19,041
School of Business		50				24,166	19,903	20,158
School of Music	*	47	15,500	14,150	14,600	14,733	16,473	16,362
School of HPER	*	17	16,300	13,600	15,400		16,638	16,638
School of Law		11					22,845	22,845
Library Science	*	*	17,600	14,200	15,900		20,150	20,150
School of Education	*	45	14,444	16,300	15,186		17,480	17,480
No School		*					18,833	18,833
Bloomington Campus	24	440	$15,620	$14,711	$15,279	$18,134	$18,759	$18,727

SOURCE: Bureau of Institutional Research Records, Indiana University

* The number of cases was less than 10.

Table 13
Average Salary by Sex/School, Bloomington Campus
Second Semester 1969-1970
Rank: Associate Professor

School/Division	Number Women	Number Men	Women Single	Women Married	Women Total	Men Single	Men Married	Men Total
A&S College:								
Arts & Humanities	*	85	$14,300	$11,400	$13,333	$12,987	$13,492	$13,397
Biological Sciences	*	14	11,310		11,310	13,000	13,950	13,814
Physical Sciences		33				13,325	14,147	14,048
Social Sciences	*	52		11,650	11,650	13,852	13,691	13,709
Non-Div. & Prof. Depts.	*	16	12,000		12,000	16,800	13,545	13,748
A&S College	8	200	12,644	11,566	12,240	13,345	13,693	13,643
School of Business	*	24		11,450	11,450	14,216	16,377	16,107
School of Music	*	32	11,933	13,200	12,250	12,400	13,819	13,642
School of HPER	*	*	12,750		12,750		13,572	13,572
School of Law	*	*	12,916		12,916		15,083	15,083
Library Science	*	*	13,194		13,194	15,000	16,112	15,556
School of Education	11	49	12,499		12,499	15,566	13,491	13,575
No School								
Bloomington Campus	30	315	$12,580	$11,870	$12,461	$13,471	$13,897	$13,845

SOURCE: Bureau of Institutional Research Records, Indiana University

* The number of cases was less than 10.

Table 14
Average Salary by Sex/School, Bloomington Campus
Second Semester 1969-1970
Rank: Assistant Professor

School/Division	Number		Women			Men		
	Women	Men	Single	Married	Total	Single	Married	Total
A&S College:								
Arts & Humanities	16	87	$10,466	$10,433	$10,460	$10,540	$10,780	$10,719
Biological Sciences	*	17	10,800		10,800	10,933	11,702	11,566
Physical Sciences		62				11,106	11,368	11,300
Social Sciences	*	35	10,800	11,500	11,150	11,137	11,188	11,176
Non-Div. & Prof. Depts.	*	*	10,933	10,167	10,741	11,500	11,542	11,537
A&S College	25	209	10,593	10,744	10,629	10,850	11,134	11,068
School of Business		24				13,033	13,914	13,804
School of Music	*	17	10,250	11,500	10,666	10,766	11,085	11,029
School of HPER	*	16	9,880	10,300	9,950	10,400	11,878	11,693
School of Law		9				15,250	15,535	15,472
Library Science	*	*	11,975		11,975		14,100	14,100
School of Education	12	44	11,734	11,000	11,611	11,433	12,250	12,194
No School	*	*	10,580		10,580		15,600	15,600
Bloomington Campus	49	325	$10,847	$10,826	$10,842	$11,111	$11,771	$11,643

SOURCE: Bureau of Institutional Research Records, Indiana University

* The number of cases was lee than 10.

Table 15
Average Salary by Sex/School, Bloomington Campus
Second Semester 1969-1970
Rank: Instructor

School/Division	Number Women	Number Men	Women Single	Women Married	Women Total	Men Single	Men Married	Men Total
A&S College:								
Arts & Humanities	*	*	$ 9,700		$ 9,700		$10,300	$10,300
Biological Sciences								
Physical Sciences								
Social Sciences				$ 8,700	$ 8,700	$ 9,166		$ 9,166
Non-Div. & Prof. Depts.	*	*						
A&S College	*	*	9,700	8,700	9,033	9,166	10,300	9,922
School of Business	*	*	7,300		7,300	7,500	9,590	9,241
School of Music	*	21	7,980		7,980	9,433	10,907	10,697
School of HPER		*				9,500		9,500
School of Law	*		9,792		9,792			
Library Science	11	19	9,486	9,061	9,254	10,978	10,609	10,667
School of Education								
No School								
Bloomington Campus	21	50	$ 8,778	$ 8,971	$ 8,852	$ 9,711	$10,601	$10,440

SOURCE: Bureau of Institutional Research Records, Indiana University

* The number of cases was less than 10.

in any one of the areas. Even research (professional publications), seemingly the area most amenable to quantification, provided problems. No listing of publications would provide an index of qualify and the most readily available listing, Bibliography of the Publications by the Faculty of the Bloomington Campus of Indiana University, did not contain entries for all faculty members.

Consequently, a case study approach was employed. The salaries of the women who felt salary discrimination might exist, as evinced by their responses to their questionnaire, were compared with the average salary and with the range of salaries of men in the same department at the same rank. The objection might be made that our sampling procedure biased the results toward finding a difference and the charge would be accurate, coincident with our intent. The demonstration of a single salary differential apparently attributable to the sex of the individual implies illegal discrimination. The sample included a number of departments, schools, and ranks. The second step in the procedure was to examine the likelihood that salary differentials could be charged to a sexist discrimination.

Whenever a discrepancy appeared to exist between the salaries of a woman and the men at the same rank in the same department, we attempted to identify the man in the same department whose professional qualifications most nearly matched those of the woman. Information was collected from confidential sources on the credentials of the individuals until the Committee was satisfied that the match was as adequate and as unbiased as possible. Our suggested matches were then transmitted to the Dean of Faculties' Office for comments on the adequacy of the matches. Whenever the Dean of Faculties' Office disagreed with the Committee's matches, additional information was sought to resolve the dispute or, if a satisfactory match proved impossible to achieve, the comparison was eliminated.

After the matching was complete, the monthly salaries of the two members of each pair were compared. In general, women made $130.53 less per month than a man in the same field who was judged to have highly similar professional qualifications (Table 16). Furthermore, the salary differential favored men in 20 of the 25 matches that were examined. These results implied that, for at least the matched cases, the salary differentials could not reasonably be attributed to the legimate areas of teaching, research, or service.

The sex of the faculty member may be linked with her or his "needs" as perceived by a departmental chairman or dean. Some of the single women faculty had been informed that they were paid less than their male colleagues (single or married) because they had fewer needs. Many of these women bear heavy financial commitments to their families. Some married women reported that they had been told that they did not need as much money as a man because they were being supported by their husbands. We maintain that such external considerations should not influence decisions about salary.

The influence of marital status on the salaries appeared to differ for the two sexes. An investigation showed that most of the single male faculty were relatively young. These men would not have had as much time to develop their teaching and research skills and would not be expected to receive salaries as high of those of older men. This salary difference may be attributable to the criteria stated in the Faculty Handbook. However, the overall salary differences between single and married women did not appear to be a function of age and thus was not related,in any obvious way, to the criteria stated in the Faculty Handbook to be the bases for salary determination.

The effects of marital status upon women's salaries varied with the employment of the spouse. In 1969-70, the average salaries of women with faculty spouses were $142 per month less than single women; the average salaries

Table 16

Average Surplus of Male Salaries over Female Salaries of Matched Sets, 1969.

Rank	Number of Matched Sets	Average Monthly Discrepancy
Professor	7	$101.50
Associate Professor	4	$154.00
Assistant Professor	14	$136.10
Totals	25	$130.53

of women with non-faculty spouses were $114 per month less than the salaries of single women. These figures, although based on small numbers of cases, suggested that faculty wives were the most poorly paid of the women faculty members. It might be claimed that married women are less productive than single women so that a salary differential would be justified in terms of their relative professional contributions. This factor would not explain the differences in salaries of women married to non-faculty rather than to faculty men. Furthermore, studies conducted elsewhere found that married women tended to be slightly more productive than single women.[2]

The last salary comparison examined the salaries of men with faculty or non-faculty spouses. Men with faculty spouses averaged $115.92 more per month than men with non-faculty spouses. This comparison was somewhat distorted by one case in which the faculty husband made $602 per month more than the average of other married men of the same rank in the same school. Ten of the faculty men married to faculty women had higher salaries than the average of married men at the same rank in the same school; five made lower salaries.

The responsibilities of faculty members to the University reside in the areas of teaching, research, and service. The competence of the faculty member in fulfilling these obligations should determine her or his salary. Personal characteristics such as sex, marital status, or needs as perceived by some departmental chairman or by another official are irrelevant and should not be allowed to affect salaries.

Power Position

The Committee examined two sources of "power": joint administrative-faculty appointments and the composition of the various Promotions and Tenure Committees of the University.

Table 17 gives the numbers of men and women holding joint administrative-faculty positions over the last three years and the proportions of male and female faculty with such positions. The information summarized in Table 17 was obtained from the Registers for each of the three years. Only major administrative appointments were tallied. In general, about 21% of the male faculty also had significant administrative responsibilities; about 7% of the female faculty had such responsibilities. We considered the possibility that more women than men refused administrative opportunities by asking a number of administrative officers about this possibility. We received no information to support the notion that women were more reluctant to assume administrative duties; hence, the inference must be that disproportionately fewer women have been given the opportunity.

The other type of power position was the composition of the promotions and tenure committees. These data are given in Table 18 for the schools with more than one woman and with regular promotions (and/or tenure) committees. Both the School of Business and School of Law have only one woman. If she were on the committee of the school, the proportionate representation would be spuriously high compared to male representation. The School of Music uses somewhat different procedures and was not included.

One woman served on the 12-member All-University Committee in 1967-68 and in 1968-69; no woman served in 1969-70. Over the three-year period, women constituted 5.6% of this committee. The membership of this committee was then restricted to full professors and in the same years, women comprised 4.6% of the full professors. Thus, male and female faculty were represented proportionately on the All-University Committee.

Approximately equal representation was shown by the promotions committees

Table 17

Number of Men and Women Holding Joint Administrative-Faculty Appointments, 1967-70

	Men		Women	
	No.	% of Total Male Faculty	No.	% of Total Female Faculty
1967-68				
Total, including deans and chairmen	253	21.6	10	7.5
Deans	46	3.9	2	1.5
Chairmen	62	5.3	2	1.5
1968-69				
Total, including deans and chairmen	247	20.7	10	7.5
Deans	53	4.4	2	1.5
Chairmen	63	5.3	1	0.7
1969-70				
Total, including deans and chairmen	262	22.5	10	7.2
Deans	46	4.0	1	0.7
Chairmen	65	5.6	1	0.7

Table 18
Characteristics of Promotions and Tenure Committees, 1967-70

School	Year	Rank Requirements	Numbers on the Committees		Women Constitute	Women Constitute
			Women	Men	---% of Committee	___ % of Qualified
Arts and Science	1969-70	Assis. or above	0	6	0.0	6.0
	1968-69	Assis. or above	0	6	0.0	5.7
	1967-68	Assis. or above	0	6	0.0	6.4
Education	1969-70	Full	0	6	0.0	10.9
	1968-69	Full	0	7	0.0	12.7
	1967-68	Full	1	6	20.0	14.3
HPER (Promotion, only)	1969-70	Assis. or above	2	4	33.0	28.3
	1968-69	Assis. or above	2	4	33.0	25.6
	1967-68	Assis. or above	2	4	33.0	24.3
Graduate Library School	1969-70	Tenured faculty	2	1	66.7	66.7
	1968-67	Tenured faculty	2	1	66.7	66.7
	1967-68	Tenured faculty	2	1	66.7	66.7
All-University	1969-70	Full	0	12	0.0	5.2
	1968-69	Full	1	11	8.3	4.5
	1967-68	Full	1	11	8.3	4.2

of HPER and of the Graduate Library School but not by the College of Arts and Science or by the School of Education. In the College of Arts and Science, appointment to this committee did not always depend upon rank; hence the total numbers of men and women with ranks of assistant professor and above was used as the basis for computing the representation. For all three years, six men and no women comprised the Arts and Science Promotions and Tenure Committee. In view of the fact that male faculty in the College outnumber women faculty by a factor of 10-11 to one, it seems reasonable to expect that a woman would be appointed to the committee at least once every two years.

The School of Education had one representative from the regional campuses serving on their committee each year. Because the study was restricted to Bloomington Campus personnel, the member representing the regional campuses was not tallied in the counts to be presented. The members of Education's committee, all full professors, were six men and no women in 1969-70; seven men and no women in 1968-69; six men and one woman in 1967-68. Over the three-year period, 19 of the 135 male full professors (14.1%) served on the committee and only one of the 17 female full professors (5.9%) served.

The survey of power positions indicated that women are less likely than men to have major administrative responsibilities in addition to teaching duties and that this discrepancy cannot be attributed to a greater tendency for women to decline administrative opportunities. Women were represented proportionately on the promotions and tenure committees of the All-University, HPER, and Graduate Library Schools; women were underrepresented on these committees of the College of Arts and Science and of the School of Education.

Summary and Recommendations

Four areas were investigated to examine the possibility of differential treatment of women and men on the faculty of Indiana University, Bloomington Campus. The four areas were hiring, promotion, salaries, and power position.

The study of hiring practices showed that there were fewer women on the faculty than would be expected on the basis of the number of terminal degrees granted to women, corrected for voluntary labor-force withdrawal. Academically qualified faculty wives have received discriminatory treatment and two departmental chairmen stated that they disapproved of hiring women.

The investigation of promotions showed that women were in rank longer than men before being recommended for promotion and before being promoted.

The salary comparisons indicated that women were paid less than men, on the average, when school of the university, and rank were taken into account. Further, married women, particularly faculty wives, were likely to have low salaries. These statements were cooroborated by comparisons between salaries paid to women and to men whose professional qualifications were approximately equal.

The analyses of power position showed that a smaller proportion of women held joint faculty-administrative positions and that they were not always represented on promotions committees in proportion to their numbers.

The data suggested that there has been discrimination against women in these areas. As the result of these findings, the Committee makes the following recommendations to Indiana University, Bloomignton Campus:

Recommendation 1. Policy.

a. The University shall not discriminate against persons on the basis of sex or marital status in hiring, promotion, tenure, salary, power position, or in any other area.
b. The Chancellor shall appoint some member(s) of his office or of the faculty to survey all policies which might discriminate against women in the university community either by explicit statement or in fact. This person or persons would review progress on all of the accompanying recommendations and report the progress annually.
c. Whenever the University announces its policy prohibiting discrimination, it should state that discrimination based on sex also is prohibited.
d. The University shall impose appropriate sanctions upon the personnel who discriminate against persons on the basis of sex.

Recommendation 2. Hiring. The Chancellor's Office shall issue a directive to all deans and departmental chairmen instructing them to increase the ratio of women on the faculty of Indiana University. This directive should be issued immediately and would be implemented in the following ways:

a. Dossiers of applicants shall be treated equally, without regard to sex or marital status.
b. Whenever the credentials of a woman match or exceed those of a male competitor, the woman shall be given the offer. This policy should remain in effect until the ratio of women on the faculty in regular positions equals the ratio of women receiving terminal degrees. At all times in the future the ratio of women on the faculty should approximate the ratio of women with terminal degrees.
c. The departments and schools should actively seek out qualified women by making statements about our policy in their recruiting activities.

This recommendation should result in an increase in the number of qualified women on the faculty. It also provides an opportunity for the hiring of women whose dossiers may not be superior to those of a male applicant. Frequently, it is difficult to differentiate between the credentials of new Ph.D.'s and past practices typically gave a chance to develop and demonstrate professional competence to men but not to women. We would like equalize these opportunities.

Recommendation 3. Salary. Immediate steps should be taken to remedy salary differentials that exist for women presently on the faculty. All decisions about salary shall be based on the critieria stated in the Faculty Handbook, excluding all other considerations.

The Committee realizes that the salaries of male colleagues may increase by lesser amounts as the salaries of women are made commensurate with those of comparable males. The recommendation was designed, in part, to eliminate factors such as limited mobility, fewer outside offers, and marital status as determinants of the salary decisions.

Recommendation 4. Promotion.

a. The Chancellor's Office shall stipulate that at least one woman be appointed to the All-University Promotions and Tenure Committee and that deans be instructed to appoint women to their Promotions and Tenure Committees whenever feasible. Hopefully, the presence of women on these committees will help to prevent the possibility that discriminatory attitudes might influence decisions about promotion and tenure.
b. The members of the committees should be made aware of the subtle factors that tend to operate against women and should be instructed to attempt to avoid letting any of these considerations influence their thinking.
c. After proportionate representation has been achieved on the entire faculty, representation on the committees should be proportional.
d. When the All-University Promotion and Tenure Committee conducts its routine check of persons who have not been recommended for promotion after a set period of time, particular attention be directed toward assessing the possibility of discrimination on the basis of sex.

It seems particularly necessary to have women on these committees whenever decisions may be made about other women. In a few schools, with one or two women on their faculties, appointment to the Promotions and Tenure Committee of that school might constitute a hardship for the woman by requiring her continuous service or by reducing the likelihood that her name would be considered. Such cases would contraindicate the appointment of a woman to the school's committee.

Recommendation 5. Power Position. A strong positive effort should be made to involve women in significant administrative and committee appointments within the University.

Recommendation 6. Maternity Leave. The University should adopt a written policy allowing women to take a one-semester leave of absence per pregnancy. This leave would be without pay. Time on leave would not count toward tenure, the possibily delaying the tenure decision occasionally, but would otherwise be treated as leaves of absence granted for any other reason.

The University might consider the possibility of granting paternity leaves also.

Recommendation 7. Independence of Faculty Spouses.

a. The Chancellor shall instruct all de s and departmental chairmen that all decisions, including those in the areas cited in the previous recommendations, be based on the performance of the individual in question and not upon her or his status as a faculty spouse.
b. Whenever the spouse of a faculty member or prosepctive faculty member applies for a position, the application shall be accorded the same consideration given to other applications.
c. If the applicant is in the same department or area as the spouse, the departmental chairman or dean may request that the Dean of Faculties appoint a committee of three people from allied fields to make an evaluation of the credentials of the applicant. This committee will report its evaluation to both the Dean of Faculties and to the departmental chairman or dean.
d. No person shall be denied consideration because her or his spouse has not be granted a position or because the spouse will not be continued in a position at Indiana University.

The Committee realizes that in cases of joint authorship or other types of professional collaboration it is difficult to evaluate the contribution of each individual. However, this judgment should be possible, given sufficient study.

Recommendation 8. Child-care Facilities. The University has a obligation to review the local child-care facilities to insure that lack of child-care opportunities is not operating as a deterrent to women. If the existing facilities are found to be a deterrent the University should take positive steps to provide such facilities.

The Committee discussed some of the different forms of child-care centers and facilities that presently exist in Bloomington. Our casual discussions were not based on a thorough study of the operations that exist, and it became obvious that such a survey is necessary to fully describe the existing arrangements. We noted that the university community might benefit in various ways from adequate child-care operations. The first, and most obvious service is the care of children. In addition, arrangements might be worked out to permit some departments to cooperate with the child-care centers for teaching-training purposes. The opportunity to observe numerous children from infancy until the age of about five years would provide a valuable, difficult-to-obtain experience for all students of child behavior.

The Committee recommends to the I.U. Chapter of the AAUP

> Recommendation 9. Study of the Status of Part-time Faculty. The AAUP shall appoint a committee to study the status of part-time faculty at Indiana University.

The responses from some faculty wives suggested that part-time employment was being used as a technique to maintain their services without providing any guarantees (even short-term) about future employment and without paying salaries that would be commensurate with the qualifications of these women. We recommend that the study include both females and males employed in part-time positions.

January 12, 1971

Dorrit C. Cohn
Marcia A. Dalbey
Dan Hopson, Jr.
Ann R. Horowitz
William W. Lynch
Margaret J. Peterson
Richard L. Pfister

Footnotes

[1] The Concerned University Women is an organization composed of women faculty, graduate students, and professional employees of Indiana University, Bloomington Campus.

[2] Folger, J.K., Astin, H.S., & Bayer, A.E. Human resources and higher education. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1970. Pp. 288-304.

Simon, R.J., Clark, S.M. & Galway, K. The woman Ph.D.: A recent profile. Social Problems, 1967, 15, 221-236.

[3] Sex discrimination: Campuses fact contract loss over HEW demands. Science, 1970, 170, 834.

[4] The questionnaire prepared by the Concerned University Women covered the proportionate representation of women among graduate students, and T.A.'s in the departments, on the faculty, the numbers of women applying for faculty positions, the numbers who were interviewed and who were hired in the last two years, the numbers of husband-wife teams employed, etc. The responses to some of these questions had to be discarded for a variety of reasons. The numbers of graduate students and T.A.'s who were or were not women occasionally were given in approximate figures or not at all; definitions of a job applicant different widely from department to department.

[5] Berry, S., and Erenburg, M. Earnings of professional women at Indiana University. Mimeographed paper, 1970.